Dar Joan, 4/27/00

Sorry I was not a clear as I should have been. Time and age take their toll, too! Some of your questions have answers that are clear to me, some do not, and while I do not question Lou Ivon's truthfilness to you, I think his explanation of the basis of their distrust ~~of~~ by Ivon is not full and complete. Not by any means.

When I said I did not "name" Boxley, I meant that it is my recollection that while what I said would likely point Salandria in that direction, I did "name" Boxley as the CIA penetrant. If any. What I now think I believed then is that Boxley's sin was of excess loyalty to Garrison, ~~who~~ and, after the CIA fired him, would still give Boxley a job. This sin manifested itself in Boxley's making up what he believed would support ~~that~~ what Garrison made up. And what Garrison had, which came to nothing, began with plagiarism to which he added his own fabrications.

Dean Andrews told me that in his own way. He recounted how the "~~Giant~~ Giant," His usual reference to Garrison, came into his office, threw a copy of Whitewash on his desk and told him he should read it. That book was, at the least, the Garrison beginning of the Clay Bertrand part of his Shaw fabrication.

As best I can recall it now, it may have been that the reason I did not "name" Boxley as a CIA penetrant, whether or not he was that, and I did not believe that, was the Salandria, being Salandria, would ~~could~~ come up with that great conclusion of his own and with it his own, he'd have more involvement, more confidence.

The CIA did not have to penetrate Garrison. He provided his own endless insanities. When I used to confront him with them I believed his false answer longer than I should have. He said he was fighting fire with fire. Garrison was entirely unembarrassed by being caught in obvious plagiarisms. If you want such a story one is clear in my mind. In part because he was not embarrassed by the transparence and because in practising his speech he fluffed that and in part because he did that when he delivered that speech. That plagiarism was from my third book and he insisted that I be there to hear him deliver it! And fluff it again.

I was sure that Salandria would suspect Boxley on his own, without my using Boxley's name to Salandria, because I believed that "Salandria could not have avoided suspecting him."

I did not believe that Boxley was working for the CIA ~~then~~ when he worked for Garrison. Aside from not believing it, I saw no CIA need for doing to Garrison what he was already doing to himself. It may have been, when I first met him, I may have suspected it but if that is so, my suspicion did not last long. You had to have been there and seen and heard Garrison ramble along with all sorts of insanities, and that for hours at a time, to be able to believe how utterly insane

all that was. Endlessly and repetitiously and in enlargement.

Both Boxley and Garrison suspected that people who were not and could not have been were CIA. Almost anyone who did not agree with them.

Garrison hired Boxley and paid him from private funds-over staff opposition. His original recommendation to Garrison was from a La. State trooper. What the staff's original opposition was I do not remember but I believe it included the lack of need for him, the danger in hiring an outsider, or both. Later Boxley himself caused the suspicion.

As to Garrison's trust of Salandria, the staff could not talk him out of his Perrin-Bradley fabrication and the only "support" if that childish fabrication was from Boxley. My god, you should have seen the awful rubbish Boxley made up that I did get to go over.

One of the Ivon suspicions of Boxley came from his secretiveness (which was at least in part Garrison's secretiveness) and another was the absence of most of his work on paper, paper that other than Garrison could review and appraise. I was, in fact, surprised at the amount of it that Ivon gathered up for me on that Perrin-Bradley fabrication, unless it was that for making the actual charge against them Garrison needed some kind of paper, no matter how much rubbish it was.

I think the basic reason Garrison trusted Boxley is that Boxley repeated Garrison back to Garrison. Boxley was bright but as you saw, much of the rubbish he turned in was only rubbish. And, without that rubbish, Garrison had nothing on which to proceed.

I do not remember seeing anything at all that led to the belief that Boxley made that crazy story up. All I remember is that he was trying to make confirmation of it up.

I do not know what got Garrison to trust Salandria's word as he did but the insane Salandria belief, on which he held forth at great and endlessly repeated length, that the secret to the Kennedy assassination was in the Trotsky assassination. fascinated Garrison as it dod. He regarded Salandria as a great thinker. That Boxley disappeared for long periods of time would have made the pro, Ivon, suspicious, but it was not that alone if that was a major factor in it. I believe that he and Sciambra and others are still loyal to Garrison and for that reason are unwilling to be more cooperative. I think that they, like I, believe that Garrison made moles if not all his junk also, not all of Boxley. They were also suspicious of the way Garrison worked with Boxley, and that was not Boxley's desire as much as it was Garrison's. Ivon was suspicious and told me he was by the absence of Boxley reports that others could read and check, by how much Garrison and Boxley kept secret. Until my involvement in the Perrin/Bradley thing I do not recall ever seeing a Boxley report.

The simple truth is that Garrison did to himself what no enemy could have done to him. The FBI had a couple of sources inside Garrison's office and if the CIA had any, I never saw any indication of it. My knowledge of the FBI's sources comes for the FBI's New Orleans records I got in CA 78-420, as I recall the case number. I was at the time reasonably confident of the identification of one of them.

Your penult graf seems to indicate your belief that Boxley made this ghastly fiction up and palmed it off on Garrison. I think the opposite is true.

It was Garrison, not Boxley, who had them meet so much entirely in private and so often away from the office. Garrison's preference was for the New Orleans Athletic Club (NOAC). He used small office rooms that I supposed had been bedrooms, at least in some cases, small dinining rooms for dining and meetings, etc. In this he was nuts. The FBI had the pair of NOAC phone operators as sources, from the FBI's own reports. But if there was any tap on the Garrison office phone I recall no FBI record even indicating the possibility.

In clarifying the matters of which you write, I again think that can best be done when you are here and as I suggested, make a tape for history if not for your use in your book, when I do think some of the outlandish stories can be of interest and use to you. Some not for use but for better understanding of the man. And of his staff and of Boxley, if not also of some of the others who flooded in there.

Some were intensely loyal. Particularly those like Ivon Bordelon and Loisel. I do not recall anything that any of them could have leaked on him. Or about him.

In what I did, I had complete independence. Evidence I wanted I asked Ivon for and he had one of the "boys" go get it. Meaning his investigators. They never pushed anything on me, made no suggestions, etc. None of them ever saw-or asked to see-anything I had written and not one of them did until Sciambra got the full text that Saturday night. He had no time for xeroxing then and I do not know what if any copies he made later.

I have a copy of the Garrison press release and of his book, as I suppose you do. Garrison had a bunch of us to lunch the coming Tuesday, in a NOAC dining room, complete with a blackboard which he again used to depict the corners of the US mainland his imagined conspiracy was made up to be based. He asked us what he should do and I suggested that he invite Boxley ro return(he was then in Texas) and to respond to what I had in that memo directly to me.

Boxley never returned.

The more I think of this the more I believe that recording of what I can recall and prompting that recall, which your questions can do, would be useful to you now and as a record for history. Some of it may raise questions about what you have done or have in mind and may prevent error of which you are not now aware. There

are few dependable and impartial sources and there soon will be even fewer. When you get to that remember is that Saturday I have no renal dialysis and now it is washing me out . From improper, and worse, medical care I have grown steadilly weaker and some time that washed-out feeling lingers onto the second day. So I hope you can arrange this for as soon as possible for you. That would give you/us Saturday and possibly Sunday or part of it..

I think it should be at some length as a record for history and I also think you'll get some colorful stuff of which you do not know and some of which you can use.

Of Shaw's lawyers, have you spoken to Sal Panzeca? about Garrison, not about the Shaw case?

I think you should also want a full account of Garrison as he prepared his press releases (all in longhand), his speeches, and his unloadings on the press that had not already turned against him, like the Los Angeles Free Press. And really stupid involvement with what turned out to be the French CIA, its SDECE. I think I have part of a file on that not turned over to Hood, as most of my records now have been. And some pictures not of the best quality. That also holds what can be interpreted with an oddball who might have had some intelligence connection. Garrison would have had a well-publicized SCEDE connection if I had not broken it up. With the spectacular ending provided by Ivon and some of his dicks.

Up to you but I think a recording of what I can recall could be of interest and I think of value as a record for history. That fiasco was a major depressant. And if his notions had no been so grandiose he could have put prople in jail and that held the potential of a different view of the subject.

There is also what he pretended to go for, did not get and declined when it was offered to him. And might very well have led him to what he could have used. There is a homosexual aspect that should be a record for history but not included in a book now, when it can be hurtful to some still living.

I've rambled and have to quit now but the more I think of what I lived through and was part of or an observer of them the more I think it should be recorded and, depending on the book you are writing, of use to it in it. And for the future. It felt unreal to me then and does not as I recall bits and pieces of which I'vnot I've not thought in years. Much that seems unreal and is solid truth, like one of those strange characters taking a liking to my wofe, who she's never seen.

Best ,

Harold